

REMARKS

An Office Action was mailed June 15, 2005. Therein, claims 1-241 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 11, 22, 31, 40, 50, 59, 69, 79, 89, 99, 109, 118, 127, 137, 147, 157, 166, 176, 185, 222, 227, and 234 are independent claims.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges Examiner's withdrawal of the restriction requirement and approval of the amended drawings filed on April 25, 2004.

By the foregoing, amendments are made to bring the claims in the application to allowance.

Claims 1-241 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over one of the applicant's own patents, namely U.S. Patent No. 5,592,321 to Elberbaum (the '321 patent).

The present invention is a plurality of methods and apparatus for connecting a fiber optic line between a transmitter and a receiver. Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, 22, 31, 59, 69, 89, 99, 109, 118, 127 and 137 to more clearly define the present invention. Thus, as is now claimed by all independent claims all transmitted signals and received signals are combined into one single bi-directional connector, such as used by coax cable.

Independent claims 1, 11, 13, 22 and 31 stand rejected on the grounds that the limitation of the claims are taught or suggested by the '321 patent. Therein, it is asserted that "transmitting a pulse signal..." is analogous to the transmitting apparatus 12 (Fig. 1 of the '321 patent), that "transmitter" is analogous to receiver 26 (Fig. 1), that the limitation "where the voltage level of the pulse signal has a higher voltage level than the maximum voltage level of the video signal or lower than the minimum voltage level of the signal" is described in col. 3, lines 27-49 of the reference, and the limitation "separating said pulse signal..." is described in col. 3, lines 37-44 of the '321 patent.

There is no suggestion or teaching in the '321 patent that the transmitter 18 of Fig. 1 or transmitter 48 of Fig. 2 transmits a pulse to the receiver 26 of Fig. 1 or receiver 54 of Fig. 2, etc. In fact, the external sync in question is generated by the external sync 44 of Fig. 1 that feeds the

external sync in question is generated by the external sync 44 of Fig. 1 that feeds the external sync pulse P1 via internal connecting lines to the transmitters 48 for propagating the external sync signal or pulse to the TV cameras 42, contrary to the present invention as claimed. The same applies to Figs. 12 and 13 wherein the internal matrix fiber connections are bi-directional. The external sync pulse is directly fed to the transmitter 144 for feeding the external sync to the TV cameras 42.

Furthermore, while bi-directional fiber transmission is notoriously well known, this also is well explained in the present application. However, the present invention is contrary to the known art. As is claimed, in the present invention an individual signal or multiplexed signals are fed to a single input connector of a fiber optic transceiver and are modulated for feeding the individual or multiplexed transmitter signals to the optical transmitter, on one hand, and extracting and demodulating the individual signal or multiplexed signals received from the optical receiver and outputting the received signal through a single output connector, on the other hand. It is well known in the art that each individual signal in either direction (of the bi-directional transceiver) is fed or received through its own individual connector, contrary to the present invention as claimed.

Neither the '321 reference nor references made of record suggest or teach combining all the transmitted signals and the received signals into one single bi-directional connector, such as used by coax cable. This is because the received (output) signals from the fiber optic transceiver could not be fed back into the input of the fiber optic transceiver, as this becomes a closed loop, which transforms the transceiver into a free run oscillator.

In such a case it is immaterial if there is one fiber optic line or a plurality of fiber optic lines. The issue is the connector between the optical transceiver and the transmission line, such as a connector to a coax cable. This is what applicant claimed, a common connector that is carrying bi-directional signals.

None of the cited Elberbaum references and any other references suggest direct connection between fiber optic transceiver to a transmission line with a common connector for bi-directional

signals. This is a fundamental difference from the well-known bi-directional fiber optic communication, cited by the examiner.

Each independent claim pending in this application recites common connectors connecting a fiber optic receiver or transmitter, respectively with a transmission line. All dependent claims respectively with a transmission line. All dependent claims pending in this application also include a common connector of the independent claim on which they respectively depend.

In view of the foregoing it is respectively submitted that claims 1-241 are not obvious over applicant's patent 5,592,321 because there is nothing in the applicant's previous patent to suggest a common connector as herein claimed.


An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the examiner's objections. All dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and passage of this case to allowance is earnestly solicited.

However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Hassan A. Shakir
Reg. No. 53,922

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
Telephone: (212) 940-8703
Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987
Docket No.: ELBX 14.852(100590-12667)
HAS:ES:fd